



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,530	09/15/2003	Chi-Tang Ho	79134-AJPW/GJC/MC	3585
23432	7590	12/28/2009		
COOPER & DUNHAM, LLP 30 Rockefeller Plaza 20th Floor NEW YORK, NY 10112			EXAMINER WARE, DEBORAH K	
			ART UNIT 1651	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/28/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/663,530

**Applicant(s)**

HO ET AL.

**Examiner**

DEBBIE K. WARE

**Art Unit**

1651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 October 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11, 12 and 15-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11, 12 and 15-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 11-12 and 15-38 are presented for reconsideration on the merits.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 10, 2009, has been entered.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

The amendment filed July 9, 2009, has been received and entered.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 11-12 and 15-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The deletion of the subject matter which describes the amount of extract of *Inula Britannica* sufficient to treat cancer is considered to be new matter.

Without the subject matter there an effective amount is not supported by the specification. For the cancer to be treated the step of administering to an animal an amount sufficient such that the cancer is treated requires Bcl-2 to be phosphorylated by the extract. Thus, without the language in the claim a sufficient amount is not supported by the instant disclosure. Applicants do not have possession at the time the claimed invention was made of a method to treat cancer wherein a composition comprising an extract of *Inula Britannica* is administered in an amount to treat cancer without the amount being determined by inducing phosphorylation of Bcl-2. Thus, deletion of the subject matter from the claims is considered to be new matter and should be put back in the claims to overcome the rejection.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 11-12 and 15-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required, are summarized in *Ex parte* Forman, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986). They include the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in the art, the amount of direction or guidance disclosed in the specification, the presence

or absence of working examples, the predictability or unpredictability of the art, the breadth of the claims, and the quantity of experimentation which would be required in order to practice the invention as claimed.

The claims are broadly drawn to methods of treating cancer in an animal in need thereof of which the animal can be human. The methods comprise administering an effective amount of a plant extract comprising OABL (1-O-acetylbritannilactone) and/or OODABL (1,6-O-O-diacetylbritannilactone). Thus, the claimed methods encompass *the treatment of cancer in humans*.

The specification teaches a variety of basic experimental analysis to illustrate the treatment of cancer in vitro of breast cancer cells, prostate cancer cells, ovarian cancer cells, etc., (page 3) and further includes the *in-vitro* induction of phosphorylation of Bcl-2 (page 34). However, with regards to decreasing cell vitality in a dose-dependent manner, the specification only teaches in vitro experimental analysis demonstrating the decrease in cell vitality and provides no extrapolation of data to support in vivo decrease of cell vitality with respect to cancer cells of the breast, prostate, ovarian, etc.

However, the claims are not enabled because said teachings represent insufficient guidance and objective evidence to predictably enable the use of the claimed invention. Thus, the claims are not enabled for in vivo treatment of cancer. Those of skill in the art recognize that in vitro assays and/or cell-culture based assays are generally useful to observe basic physiological and cellular phenomenon such as screening the effects of potential drugs. However, clinical correlations are generally lacking. The greatly increased complexity of the in vivo environment as compared to

the very narrowly defined and controlled conditions of an in-vitro assay does not permit a single extrapolation of in vitro assays to human diagnostic efficacy with any reasonable degree of predictability. In vitro assays cannot easily assess cell-cell interactions that may be important in a particular pathological state.

Furthermore it is well known in the art that cultured cells, over a period time, lose phenotypic characteristics associated with their normal counterpart cell type. Freshney (Culture of Animal Cells, A Manual of Basic Technique, Alan R. Liss, Inc., 1983, New York, p4) teach that it is recognized in the art that there are many differences between cultured cells and their counterparts *in vivo*. These differences stem from the dissociation of cells from a three-dimensional geometry and their propagation on a two-dimensional substrate. Specific cell interactions characteristic of histology of the tissue are lost. The culture environment lacks the input of the nervous and endocrine systems involved in homeostatic regulation *in vivo*. Without this control, cellular metabolism may be more constant *in vitro* but may not be truly representative of the tissue from which the cells were derived. This has often led to tissue culture being regarded in a rather skeptical light (p. 4, see Major Differences *In Vitro*).

In addition, Dermer (Bio/Technology, 1994, 12:320) teaches that, "petri dish cancer" is a poor representation of malignancy, with characteristics profoundly different from the human disease. Dermer teaches that when a normal or malignant body cell adapts to immortal life in culture, it takes an evolutionary type step that enables the new line to thrive in its artificial environment. This step transforms a cell from one that is stable and differentiated to one that is not. Yet normal or malignant cells *in vivo* are not

like that. The reference states that evidence of the contradictions between life on the bottom of a lab dish and in the body has been in the scientific literature for more than 30 years. Clearly it is well known in the art that cells in culture exhibit characteristics different from those *in vivo* and cannot duplicate the complex conditions of the *in vivo* environment involved in host-tumor and cell-cell interactions.

Also, treatment of cancer in general is at most unpredictable, as underscored by Gura (Science, v278, 1997, pp.1041-1042) who discusses the potential shortcomings of potential anti-cancer agents including extrapolating from in-vitro to in-vivo protocols, the problems of drug testing in knockout mice, and problems associated with clonogenic assays. Indeed, since formal screening began in 1955, thousands of drugs have shown activity in either cell or animal models, but only 39 that are used exclusively for chemotherapy, as opposed to supportive care, have won approval from the FDA (page 1041, 1<sup>st</sup> column) wherein the fundamental problem in drug discovery for cancer is that the model systems are not predictive. All of this underscores the criticality of providing workable examples which is not disclosed in the specification, particularly in an unpredictable art, such as cancer therapy.

A review of the literature concerning the chemical containing extracts further does not reveal any therapeutic applications in the oncological setting.

In view of the teachings above, and the lack of guidance and or exemplification in the specification, it would not be predictable that the method would function as contemplated. Thus, it would require undue experimentation by one of skill in the art to practice the invention as claimed.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed July 10, 2009, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The argument regarding the Mora is noted, however, Applicants' arguments are relying on model cell lines which allegedly maintain their phosphorylation state over time, however, the instant claims do not require phosphorylation. Furthermore, Mora et al., specifically disclose at page 6665, col. 1, lines 2-5, that "it is important to note, however, that rapid processing (less than 15 minutes from surgical removal) is essential for preserving the in vivo phosphorylation state of the protein and hence for obtaining reliable data for cancer cells". Therefore, this shows that there is unpredictability in the art for the correlation of an in vitro assay with in vivo, because how will a correlation be able to be made with the use of the same data obtained therefrom in vitro for use in vivo in an animal since the data obtained in vitro is not always reliable. For these reasons and those of record the claims remain rejected as not being enabled because no in vivo studies have been conducted to demonstrate the claimed invention.

No claims are allowed, however, the claims are free of the prior art.

The references cited on the previously enclosed PTO-892 Form are cited to show the state of the art and are also discussed above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deborah K. Ware whose telephone number is 571-272-0924. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.



If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Deborah K. Ware/  
Deborah K. Ware  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1651